



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/802,621	03/09/2001	Pekka Tapio Pessi	460-010211-US(PAR)	7641
7590 07/12/2005			EXAMINER FERRIS, DERRICK W	
Clarence A. Green Perman & Green, LLP 425 Post Road Fairfield, CT 06430			ART UNIT 2663	

DATE MAILED: 07/12/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/802,621

Applicant(s)

PESSI, PEKKA TAPIO

Examiner

Derrick W. Ferris

Art Unit

2663

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 January 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 09 March 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. This Office action is in response to applicant's paper filed 2/24/2005. **Claims 1-16** as amended are still in consideration for this application. Applicant has amended claims 1-10. Applicant has canceled no claims. Applicant has added claims 11-16.
2. Examiner **withdraws** the specification objection(s). Examiner thanks applicant for making the necessary corrections.
3. Examiner does **not withdraw** the anticipated rejection to *Forslow*. The following comments fully address applicant's arguments with respect to the rejection. Applicant's arguments filed 2/24/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., RTP header compression) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). In particular, applicant adds the above limitation in newly added claims 11 and 14. As such, please see the examiner's response with respect to the obviousness rejection as necessitated by applicant's claim amendment(s).
4. Examiner does **not withdraw** the obviousness rejection to *Forslow* in view of *Nichols*. The following comments fully address applicant's arguments with respect to the rejection. In particular, please see similar above with respect to the anticipated rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Art Unit: 2663

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. **Claims 1-7 and 10** rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent

No. 6,609,832 B2 to *Forslow*.

As to **claim 1**, see e.g., figure 2 where a sender may be a mobile 16 and a receiver may be a node attached to the ISP 58 and where the communications network could be either the GPRS network 51 or the IP data network 56. As such, see figure 7 which shows applications flows as a video, audio, and conferencing application flow. Note in figure 7 that the QoS is mapped to the application flow. Thus the applications are subject to “optimization methods” based on the associated application flow. For example, the solution provides a bearer selection and quality of service parameter mapping layer which selects for each application flow at the IP layer the best suited one of a circuit-switched bearer and a packet switch bearer rather than using a multiplexer which would multiplex all the application flows together, see e.g., column 12, lines 11-24. The quality of service signaling protocol is RSVP also shown in figure 7 as part of the system control flow, e.g., see column 10, line 54 – column 12, line 10 and in particular column 12, lines 1-10.

As to **claim 2**, see figure 7 where a description would be the type of application such as audio, video or conferencing.

Art Unit: 2663

As to **claim 3**, QoS is optimized since a bearer section and quality of service parameter mapping layer is taught for each application flow, see e.g., column 12, lines 11-35.

As to **claims 4-5**, RTP is taught which is real-time, see e.g., figure 7.

As to **claim 6-7**, RSVP reserves the session at teach node as taught per the RSVP standard. In particular, the RSVP standard teaches a PATH, RESV, and RESVCONF message.

As to **claim 10**, see similar rejection to claim 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. **Claims 8-9** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,609,832 B2 to *Forslow* in view of "Definition of the Differentiated Services Field (DS) in the IIPv4 or Ipv6 Headers" to *Nichols et al.* ("*Nichols*").

In making a proper obviousness rejection under MPEP 706.02(j), the examiner will address the following four steps:

- a) *the relevant teachings of the prior art relied upon, preferably with reference to the relevant column or page number(s) and line numbers where appropriate;*
- b) *the difference of differences in the claim(s) over the applied cited references;*
- c) *the proposed modification of the applied reference(s) necessary to arrive at the claimed subject matter; and*

Art Unit: 2663

d) an explanation why one skilled in the art at the time of the invention was made would have been motivated to make the proposed modification.

As such to **claims 8-9**, for step (a) *Forslow* discloses the limitations in the parent claim.

For step (b) *Forslow* is silent or deficient to the further limitation of supporting DiffServ or the like. In particular, *Forslow* discloses general QoS support and provides an example of RSVP.

Nichols teaches the further recited limitation above at e.g., see the abstract.

For step (c), the proposed modification of the above-applied reference(s) necessary to arrive at the claimed subject matter would be to modify *Forslow* by also using DiffServ.

In order to establish a prima facie case of obviousness for step (d), three basic criteria must be met. The three criteria according to MPEP 706.02(j) are as follows:

First there must be some suggestion or modification, either in the reference(s) themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine the reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.

As such, for step (d) examiner notes that it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art prior to applicant's invention to include the further limitation supporting DiffServ or the like. In particular, the motivation for modifying the reference or to combine the reference teachings would be to provide QoS without maintaining a state for each node. In particular, *Nichols* cures the above-cited deficiency by providing a motivation found at e.g., the abstract. Second, there would be a reasonable expectation of

Art Unit: 2663

success since both references support IP, e.g., see figure 7 of *Forslow*. Thus the references either in singular or in combination teach the above claim limitation(s).

9. **Claims 11-16** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,609,832 B2 to *Forslow* in view of “Efficient Use of Wireless Bandwidth for Multimedia Applications” to *Larzon et al.* (“*Larzon*”).

As to **claim 11**, *Forslow* teaches using RTP packets but may be silent or deficient to RTP header compression, see e.g., figure 7. *Larzon* teaches RTP header compression (i.e., CRTP) at e.g., page 188. Thus the examiner proposes to modify *Forslow* to clarify that CRTP can also be used since CRTP is well known in the art prior to applicant’s invention. Hence examiner notes that it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art prior to applicant’s invention to use RTP header compression. In particular, one skilled in the art would have been motivated to use RTP header compression for at least the purpose of reducing the probability of losing packets due to errors. *Larzon* teaches the above motivation at e.g., right-hand column on page 188. Examiner also notes a reasonable expectation of success since CRTP is applied to a wireless system.

As to **claims 12-13**, see e.g., column 10, lines 44-45 of *Forslow* where the applied QoS may be implemented in a gateway device (i.e., router).

As to **claim 14**, see similar rejection to claim 11.

As to **claims 15-16**, see e.g., column 10, lines 44-45 of *Forslow* where the applied QoS may be implemented in a gateway device (i.e., router).

Conclusion

Art Unit: 2663

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Derrick W. Ferris whose telephone number is (571) 272-3123. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9 A.M. - 4:30 P.M. E.S.T.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ricky Ngo can be reached on (571)272-3139. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2663

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Derrick W. Ferris
Examiner
Art Unit 2663


DWF


RICKY NGO
PRIMARY EXAMINER
7/8/05